

addl. for R & R

**Roland Bartl**

---

**From:** Kristin Alexander  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 22, 2008 12:16 PM  
**To:** Roland Bartl  
**Subject:** FW: 7/22/08 Planning Board Meeting Packet



Quail ridge  
questions for meet...

Hi Roland,

Ruth went through her earlier questions related to the Residences at Quail Ridge and pulled out the ones that she thought staff should look at before the meeting tonight. They are in the attached document. Since you are staffing the meeting tonight, I'm forwarding it to you for comments/response. Thanks.

Kristin

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Ruth Martin  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 22, 2008 10:04 AM  
**To:** Kristin Alexander  
**Subject:** Re: 7/22/08 Planning Board Meeting Packet

Kristin,

The docushare is 'full' and I can't access the PB documents (although I had looked at them earlier - others might be trying to access)

Also - I am attaching several questions from my earlier e-mail, but these are a few items that might be suitable for staff to look at before the meeting, if there are materials or answers they can provide before the meeting. But, if you think these should be held as well for the public meeting - that's ok too.

Thanks,  
Ruth Martin  
Thanks,  
Ruth

July 19, 2008

questions about Quail Ridge Traffic study /Access/ and Emergency Access

1. Are we still expecting any updates from QR traffic study – there are no Conley Associates studies more recent than Dec. 2007? The Conley report dated Oct. 19, 2007 states in #d: ‘access for the project has been modified. Only one access will be provided on Skyline Drive for general traffic... ‘The issue of internal distribution is moot’ there is no reason to analyze decision made for single access? I thought we were specifically going to be reviewing this analysis – why have they determined that this issue is already ‘moot’?

*A: No updates are expected. Applicant will have Conley Assoc. Rep. attending tonight to present earlier findings. I think the 10/19/07 memo came after the Board’s preliminary leanings towards a single access had become apparent at that time.*

2. Litigation – says that the Town filed an answer to the complaint on July 1, 2008 - do we have a copy?

*A: I am not sure about the date. I have not seen the Town’s answer. Court documents usually remain at Town Counsel’s office unless they are of substance and/or prepared with the client. Both RQR and AP complaints were simple enough – aimed only at preserving the right to file further complaints against the supplemental decision. Both parties concern was the need for filing an appeal within 20 days of the original decision. The process of a supplemental hearing and decision is a bit of a novelty w/o precedent for appeals to a supplemental decision. Accordingly the Town’s answer did not require anything more than “formality” type responses - simple and without substance. Substance may follow after the Board’s action following the supplemental hearing.*

3. The Developer raises for the 1<sup>st</sup> time an emergency access that would be ‘ungated’ (although this contradicts statements made by abutters report that they are in agreement about emergency access only (??) – is there any precedent for that in Acton ? Elsewhere?

*A: Emergency accesses can take different shapes and forms. ‘Ungated’ emergency access could be designed. I am not sure if AP would be agreeable to that. The decision did not mention ‘ungated’ emergency access as one of the options to be explored. I suppose it could be added as a consideration. That would, of course, not address the other issue area about traffic circulation and the Great Road access bottlenecks.*

4. Any ramifications to the fact that Quail Ridge roads will be private? The road stubs in AP are 'existing public way street extensions' – but QR streets will be private. Acorn Park residents won't have reciprocal rights to pass through Quail Ridge to 119 (not that they would want to)? (isn't there even a question that AP only has one access and does not have emergency alternative access either?)

*A: The private/public road issue is real when it comes to emergency access. Each side would have to be a reliable partner in keeping it clear and functional.*

*Access for AP residents can be secured through a requirement by the Planning Board to allow street in the RQR project to be used "by the public for all purposes for which streets and ways are used in the Town." AP has only one street access right now. An emergency access exists between the end of Walnut Street and Great Road. But, it is the kind that leaves you wondering if it would be available when needed. The AP situation is a bit less severe than RQR would be. Where AP drive is a single access, it very wide for the most part, and as soon as it narrows down, it splits.*

5. Are there any pertinent records from the original Acorn Park permitting process that discussed the road stubs (which are not discussed in the traffic study) – what was foreseen at the time – assumed that Acorn Park might grow in that direction – or a similar type of subdivision – what was expected access when stubs were put in?

*A: They are on file and could be pulled. In brief, the concern at the time was to provide for adequate and appropriate circulation and at least dual access for what could become substantial neighborhoods. Accordingly, the public way stubs were created to adjacent land. But, the Board also stipulated that these stubs, with the exception of something like 10 single-family house lots, cannot be used as access to new development in land adjacent to AP unless there is also full access to Great Road. In that sense the applicant's original plan with dual AP access was implementing exactly what the Planning Board had provided for 15 years earlier.*

6. What would be traffic impact of an Acorn-park like development on the same land area in Quail Ridge – would the analysis be the same? (Rolland stated earlier that there would not be a significant difference in traffic amount if this had been a regular subdivision on this amount of land.)

***A: The ITE Trip Generation Manual assigns an AWDT rate of 9.57 to single-family homes. Conley Assoc. computed a composite AWDT rate (based on ITE statistics) of 4.79 for the RQR project (senior housing – single-unit detached, duplex, and multi-unit buildings, 9-hole golf course, one restaurant).***

## Roland Bartl

---

**From:** Ruth Martin  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 20, 2008 4:13 PM  
**To:** Planning Board; Kim DelNigro  
**Subject:** Clarification about QR discussion on July 22, 2008



RMartin Quail Ridge  
questions ...

I have attached a document with some of my questions and Comments I put together for myself in preparation for the PB meeting on QR access, and which I will discuss at the meeting.

But, the one question I wanted to raise before the meeting is to clarify what are parameters of the QR access discussion this Tuesday, July 22? Is it contemplated as being a public forum and PB discussion, but not a vote? Or will there be a vote? If so - will it be on the final decision on access, or whether or not we think we need a peer review and how to solicit a bid, who will pay, etc?

Thanks,  
Ruth Martin

July 19, 2008

Ruth Martin's questions about Quail Ridge Traffic study /Access/ and Emergency Access

1. What are parameters of discussion this Tuesday, July 22? Is this just a discussion with no vote? Will there be a vote? Will the vote be whether or not we think we need a peer review? If no – then we make a decision on the access that night – if yes – we need to determine who will pay for the peer review? How to go out to bid?
2. Are we still expecting any updates from QR traffic study – there are no Conley Associates studies more recent than Dec. 2007? The Conley report dated Oct. 19, 2007 states in #d: 'access for the project has been modified. Only one access will be provided on Skyline Drive for general traffic... 'The issue of internal distribution is moot' there is no reason to analyze decision made for single access? I thought we were specifically going to be reviewing this analysis – why have they determined that this issue is already 'moot'?
3. Traffic study hard for me to understand on the potential impact of the intersection at 27 and 2A (if only one access point) – especially with the added congestion of major development in west (Avalon & Littleton)
4. Litigation – says that the Town filed an answer to the complaint on July 1, 2008 - do we have a copy?
5. The Developer raises for the 1<sup>st</sup> time an emergency access that would be 'ungated' (although this contradicts statements made by abutters report that they are in agreement about emergency access only (??) – is there any precedent for that in Acton ? Elsewhere?
6. AP traffic study recommends electronic gate with manual override (gives example from New Hampshire) – they don't seem to be in agreement with QR which seems to proposed ungated emergency access/.
7. Fire chief opinion that one access with gated emergency access is sufficient – how much 'weight' do we give this opinion?
8. Any ramifications to the fact that Quail Ridge roads will be private? The road stubs in AP are 'existing public way street extensions' – but QR streets will be private. Acorn Park residents won't have reciprocal rights to pass through Quail Ridge to 119 (not that they would want to)? (isn't there even a question that AP only has one access and does not have emergency alternative access either?

9. Impact of restaurant on the analysis – (30-50 seats – open to public?) impact of added traffic – commercial use, v. residential – does this impact whether or not the Quail Ridge road is private? Also, reference to the proposed restaurant is not consistent in the materials provided by QR – it is sometimes factored in – sometimes not.
10. Are there any pertinent records from the original Acorn Park permitting process that discussed the road stubs (which are not discussed in the traffic study) – what was foreseen at the time – assumed that Acorn Park might grow in that direction – or a similar type of subdivision – what was expected access when stubs were put in?
11. What would be traffic impact of an Acorn-park like development on the same land area in Quail Ridge – would the analysis be the same? (Rolland stated earlier that there would not be a significant difference in traffic amount if this had been a regular subdivision on this amount of land.)
12. Ramifications of making decision now for this senior housing/golf/restaurant complex – what if it is never built – is re-sold and to be developed as 40B – or as a residential subdivision? Are these decisions made now binding on any future owners/developments?
13. Any ramifications to this decision that would trigger the need to change our SRR rules – if our ‘waivers’ to the access requirements are granted when the numbers are WAY over 40 units? Also, given the fact that Acton has not been consistent in enforcing this requirement (AP raises this, but doesn’t cite specifics – Avalon??) others? AP itself! A zoning change would take into account perhaps the existence of these new remote access/sensor type of emergency access gates?
14. E-mails from Carol Holley: - One thing I would suggest is when we receive e-mails on topics we are discussing, that the people identify themselves – address, affiliation (if any, etc).